THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.22622 of 2007

Date:07.12.2007

Between:
Kotikalapudi Subba Rao and five others.

...
Petitioners

AND
The State of A.P., reptd., by its
Principal Secretary to Forest Department,
Secretariat, Saifabad, Hyderabad and another.

... Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: None appeared.

Counsel for the respondents: Govt. Pleader for Forests.

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.22622 of 2007

ORDER:-

This Writ Petition is filed for the following substantive relief:

> "... ... to issue a writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in insisting the petitioners to vacate from the land of about Ac.15.00 cents covered by R.S.No.454/1 of Katrenipadu Revenue village pursuant to the notice in Roc.No.133/2006, dated 17-9-2007 issued by the 2nd respondent as illegal, irregular, arbitrary, without jurisdiction, violative of principles of natural justice, provisions of Andhra Pradesh Forest Act, 1967 and offends Articles 14, 21 and 300A of Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents not to dispossess the petitioners from the possession of the said land".

On 6-11-2007 as no one has appeared for the petitioners, the Writ Petition was adjourned to 27-11-2007. On that day, the following order was passed:

> "A request is again made on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioners for adjournment.
>
> Since the Writ Petition is already adjourned on three occasions earlier, the request of the learned counsel is accepted to give him a last chance".

On 6-12-2007 again there was no representation and the Writ Petition is posted for dismissal today. When the matter is called today, Sri R.C.S.P. Ganta, Advocate, made a request on behalf of counsel for the petitioners for adjournment. Since the case has been adjourned from time to time, and as a last chance on 27-11-2007, I am not inclined to adjourn the Writ

Petition further. From the fact that the learned counsel has not argued the case despite giving repeated opportunities shows that the petitioners are not interested in prosecuting their case.

The Writ Petition is, therefore, dismissed for default.

As a sequel to dismissal of the Writ Petition, WPMP No.29403 of 2007 is also dismissed.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY,J
07-12-2007
MNR